

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

New claim 17 has been added by amendment.

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GB 1,062,979 (hereinafter “‘979”). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, the ‘979 patent does not teach “an ultrasonic nebulizer” as required. The Examiner cites the spray unit (70) of the ‘979 patent as the ultrasonic nebulizer of claim 1. However, nowhere in the ‘979 patent is it taught that the spray unit (70) uses ultrasonic waves to nebulize water, or that the spray unit (70) is “ultrasonic” in any way.

Further, regarding claim 1, the ‘979 patent does not teach that “air within said interior region (4) is recirculated by said ventilator (7) through an air duct (10) located between said internal walls (3) and said external walls (2) forming *a closed loop*,” as required. In the ‘979 patent, as shown in Fig. 2, an outlet (82) is provided “to vent some of the drying medium to the atmosphere.” (Page 3, lines 49-52.) Therefore, the exhaust manifold (40) is clearly not operating as a closed loop.

Regarding claim 2, the ‘979 patent does not teach “said water supply means (8) comprising a removable water reservoir (15) feeding a pocket (16) hydraulically connected thereto,” as required. The Examiner states that this feature is “inherently disclosed in that reference because an operator of the disclosed invention would need to monitor water absence otherwise the disclosed invention would be inoperative.” Applicants respectfully disagree. No water reservoir that feeds the spray unit (70) is shown or described in the ‘979 patent. It is not

Appl. No. 10/561,742
Amdt. dated July 10, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 16, 2007

inherent that there would be a water reservoir, since it is completely possible that the conduit means (72), which delivers water or steam to the unit, could be directly connected to a source of water, such that a water reservoir is unnecessary.

For at least the above reasons, every limitation of the claims is not taught by the cited reference as required to maintain a rejection on the grounds of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. WZP 39288.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: Aaron A. Fishman/
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

July 10, 2007